
**VILLAGE OF BROOKFIELD, ILLINOIS
GRAND BOULEVARD TAX INCREMENT FINANCE
DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY REPORT**

A study to determine whether all or a portion of an area located in the Village of Brookfield qualifies as a “conservation area” as set forth in the definition in the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3, et seq., as amended.

Prepared for: Village of Brookfield, Illinois

Prepared by: Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc.

August, 2019

VILLAGE OF BROOKFIELD, ILLINOIS
GRAND BOULEVARD TAX INCREMENT FINANCE DISTRICT
ELIGIBILITY REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SECTION</u>	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
	Executive Summary	i
I.	Introduction and Background	1
II.	Qualification Criteria	4
III.	Methodology of Evaluation	7
IV.	Qualification Findings for RPA	8
V.	Summary of Findings	13

Appendix A: Tax Parcels for RPA

Appendix B: Boundary Map of RPA

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. (KMA) has been retained by the Village of Brookfield (the “Village”) to conduct an analysis of the qualification of an area for the establishment of the Grand Boulevard Tax Increment Finance (TIF) District. The Village is pursuing the creation of the Grand Boulevard TIF District to promote the revitalization of under-utilized properties located within the Village and the overall improvement of the wider downtown area.

In planning for the establishment of the Grand Boulevard Tax Increment Financing District (the “TIF District,” the “TIF,” “Redevelopment Project Area,” or “RPA”), the Village has initiated the study of the RPA to determine whether it qualifies under the Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act, 65 ILCS 5/11-74.4-3, et seq., as amended (the “TIF Act” or “Act”) for inclusion in a TIF District. KMA agreed to undertake the study of the RPA on the Village’s behalf.

Based upon the analysis completed to date, KMA has reached the following conclusions regarding the potential qualification of the RPA:

- 1) *The area qualifies as a “conservation area”* – The RPA qualifies as a conservation area as defined under the TIF Act. Further, the conservation area factors found in the RPA are present to a meaningful extent and are distributed throughout the area.
- 2) *The current conditions impede redevelopment* – The existence of certain conditions found within the RPA present a barrier to the area’s successful redevelopment. The current conditions in the RPA are impediments to redevelopment, creating an environment where it is reasonable to conclude redevelopment would not take place “but for” the use of the TIF Act. The factors present on the ground negatively impact coordinated and substantial private sector investment in the overall area. Without the use of Village planning and economic development resources to mitigate such factors, potential redevelopment projects (along with other activities that require private sector investment) are not likely to be economically feasible.
- 3) *Viable redevelopment sites could produce incremental revenue* – The RPA potentially could, with TIF-related assistance, be redeveloped and thereby produce incremental property tax revenue. Such revenue, used in combination with other Village resources for redevelopment incentives or public improvements, would likely stimulate private investment and reinvestment in these sites and ultimately throughout the RPA.
- 4) *TIF designation is recommended* – To mitigate conservation area conditions, promote private sector investment, and foster the economic viability of the RPA, KMA recommends that the Village proceed with the formal TIF designation process for the entire area.

It is further found, and certified by the Village, that the projected redevelopment of the RPA will not result in the displacement of ten (10) inhabited residential units or more, and that the RPA contains less than seventy-five (75) inhabited residential units. Therefore, a Housing Impact Study has not been developed as otherwise would be required

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The RPA is located in the central portion of the Village situated at the intersection of Grand Boulevard, Prairie Avenue and Brookfield Avenue. The RPA is approximately fourteen (14) acres in size excluding rights-of-way. Please see Appendix A for a list of tax parcels within the RPA and Appendix B for a detailed map of the RPA's boundaries.

The RPA overlays the Village's historical commercial center and is comprised of commercial, retail, residential and mixed-uses. The majority of structures are older and contribute to a historical aesthetic that is common to many suburban downtowns.

The area is centered around the intersection of Grand Boulevard and Prairie Avenue, two major local collectors which each experience traffic counts in excess of 3,000 vehicles per day. Additionally, the area is in close proximity to Ogden Avenue, a major arterial which experiences traffic counts in excess of 25,000 vehicles per day. The RPA also contains the Brookfield Metra Station, a part of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railway Company's (BSNF) commuter rail line which services over fifteen million riders annually. Additional characteristics that are advantageous to the area include its close proximity to local parks, bike trails, the Village's 8 Corners commercial district, Salt Creek and Brookfield Zoo.

In recent years the Village has sought to advantage the area's aesthetic and favorable location in an effort to revitalize the area, expand the Village's tax base and achieve certain goals and objectives expressed in the Village of Brookfield Comprehensive Plan (adopted January 2018), the Downtown Brookfield Subarea Plan (January 2018) and the Brookfield Active Transportation Plan (September 2017).

Table 1. Comprehensive Plan Goals & Objectives Relevant to RPA

Element	Goals/Objectives
Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Improve the appearance and competitiveness of retail and commercial shopping areas in existing commercial nodes in the Village- Create a connected system of pedestrian and bicycle access and circulation that integrates with the existing urban fabric and ensures safe and convenient travel between commercial corridors- Identify, inventory, and assemble underutilized parcels for redevelopment within the commercial corridors and nodes- Prioritize the 8 Corners area and the Downtown Brookfield Metra Station area as the Village's primary mixed-use pedestrian-oriented environments- Provide Opportunities for redevelopment in Brookfield's residential neighborhoods and commercial nodes

Housing & Neighborhoods	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Encourage and support the development of diverse housing products at various price points and sizes, including senior and multi-family housing - Support neighborhoods for all ages and abilities that are compact, walkable and connected to major commercial nodes and available transportation
Transportation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Promote a multi-modal transportation system that maximizes mobility options - Use transportation as a tool to enhance the character of the Village and the quality of life for its residents - Support economic development with transportation strategies that increase access and connectivity to destinations in the Village and prioritize multi-modal improvements

Despite the area's numerous assets, achievement of the Village's goals and objectives has been challenged by certain existing conditions in the RPA. For example, the Brookfield Active Transportation Plan (September, 2017) describes the area as being difficult to navigate with a perception of being unsafe; the Downtown Subarea Plan (January, 2018) describes the existence of numerous underutilized sites in the area that require redevelopment; and, the Village of Brookfield Comprehensive Plan (January, 2018) identifies an increasing need to encourage density and to attract additional retailers to the area. These plans clearly establish the importance of the RPA. They also describe characteristics of the area which deter investment or signal an overall lack of investment. Such characteristics include the presence of obsolete and deteriorating improvements, inadequate utilities, a lack of adequate planning, deleterious layout and the presence of excessive vacancies.

Objectives - The Village's general economic and community development objectives include revitalizing the Village's downtown district, planning for future growth, increasing density and the number of mixed-uses in the downtown district, enhancing connectivity for all modes of travel, increasing the number of retail uses in the downtown district and increasing and diversify the Villages' economic base.

Given the Village's objectives as well the conditions described in this report, the Village had made a determination that it is highly desirable to promote the redevelopment of the underutilized-areas of the proposed RPA. Without an implementation plan for redevelopment, Village officials believe adverse conditions will worsen. The Village intends to create and implement such a plan in order to restore, stabilize and increase the economic base associated with the RPA, which will not only benefit the community as a whole but also generate additional tax revenues to support municipal services.

Determination of the “But For” - The Village has determined that planned redevelopment for the RPA is feasible only with public finance assistance. The creation and utilization of a TIF redevelopment plan and redevelopment agreements are intended by the Village to help provide the assistance required to eliminate conditions detrimental to successful redevelopment of the RPA and to improve the tax base and job creation within the Village.

TIF Mechanism - The use of TIF relies upon induced private redevelopment in the RPA to create higher real estate values that would otherwise decline without such investment. By so doing, it would result in increased property taxes compared to the previous land use (and/or absence of use). In this way, the existing tax base for all tax districts would be protected and a portion of future increased taxes pledged to attract the requisite private investment.

General Scope and Methodology - KMA formally began its analysis by conducting a series of meetings and discussions with Village staff starting in March, 2019 and continuing up to the date of this report’s issuance. The purpose of the meetings was to establish boundaries for initial analysis and to gather data related to the qualification criteria for parcels included in the RPA. These meetings were complemented by a series of field surveys for the entire area to evaluate the condition of the proposed TIF. KMA made numerous site visits to the area to examine the parcels and the conditions in the RPA. KMA also utilized the Village’s most recent comprehensive plan and other Village reports as previously referenced.

For the purpose of the study, properties within the RPA were examined in the context of the TIF Act governing improved areas (separate provisions of the Act address non-improved or vacant areas). The qualification factors discussed in this report qualify the area as a conservation area as the term is defined pursuant to the TIF Act.

During the course of its work, KMA reported to key Village staff its findings regarding TIF qualification and feasibility prospects for the area under study. Based on these findings the Village (a) made refinements to the RPA boundaries and (b) directed KMA to complete this report and to move forward with the preparation of a Redevelopment Plan and Project for the RPA.

For additional information about KMA’s data collection and evaluation methods, refer to Section IV of this report.

II. QUALIFICATION CRITERIA

With the assistance of Village staff, Kane, McKenna and Associates, Inc. assessed the RPA to determine the presence or absence of qualifying factors listed in the TIF Act. The relevant sections of the Act are found below.

The Act sets out specific procedures which must be adhered to in designating a RPA. By definition, a RPA is:

“An area designated by the municipality, which is not less in the aggregate than 1½ acres and in respect to which the municipality has made a finding that there exist conditions which cause the area to be classified as a blighted area or a conservation area, or a combination of both blighted areas and conservation areas.”

Under the Act, conservation area, means any improved area within the boundaries of a RPA located within the territorial limits of the municipality where certain conditions are met, as identified below.

TIF Qualification Factors for a Conservation Area - In accordance with the Illinois TIF Act, KMA performed a two-step assessment to determine if the RPA would qualify as a conservation area. Initially, KMA analyzed the threshold factor of age to determine if 50% or more of the structures were at least 35 years of age.

If a proposed conservation area meets the age threshold, then the following factors are examined to determine TIF qualification:

If a “*conservation area*,” industrial, commercial and residential buildings or improvements are detrimental to the public safety, health or welfare because of a combination of three or more of the following factors, each of which is (i) present, with that presence documented to a meaningful extent so that a municipality may reasonably find that the factor is clearly present within the intent of the Act and (ii) reasonably distributed throughout the improved part of the RPA:

A) Dilapidation: An advanced state of disrepair or neglect of necessary repairs to the primary structural components of building or improvements in such a combination that a documented building condition analysis determines that major repair is required or the defects are so serious and so extensive that the buildings must be removed.

B) Obsolescence: The condition or process of falling into disuse. Structures become ill-suited for the original use.

C) Deterioration: With respect to buildings, defects are evident, including, but not limited to, major defects in the secondary building components such as doors, windows, porches, gutters, downspouts, and fascia. With respect to surface improvements, that the condition of roadways, alleys, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, off-street parking and surface storage areas demonstrate evidence of deterioration, including, but limited to, surface cracking, crumbling, potholes, depressions, loose paving material and weeds protruding through paved surfaces.

D) Presence of Structures Below Minimum Code Standards: All structures that do not meet the standards of zoning, subdivision, building, fire and other governmental codes applicable to property, but not including housing and property maintenance codes.

E) Illegal Use of Individual Structures: The use of structures in violation of applicable Federal, State, or local laws, exclusive of those applicable to the presence of structures below minimum code standards.

F) Excessive Vacancies: The presence of buildings that are unoccupied or under-utilized and that represent an adverse influence on the area because of the frequency, extent, or duration of the vacancies.

G) Lack of Ventilation, Light, or Sanitary Facilities: The absence of adequate ventilation for light or air circulation in spaces or rooms without windows, or that require the removal of dust, odor, gas, smoke or other noxious airborne materials. Inadequate natural light and ventilation means the absence of skylights or windows for interior spaces or rooms and improper window sizes and amounts according to room area to window area ratio requirements. Inadequate sanitary facilities refer to the absence or inadequacy of garbage storage and enclosure, bathroom facilities, hot water and kitchens and structural inadequacies preventing ingress and egress to and from all rooms and units within a building.

H) Inadequate Utilities: Underground and overhead utilities such as storm sewers and storm drainage, sanitary sewers, water lines and gas, telephone and electrical services that are shown to be inadequate. Inadequate utilities are those that are: (i) of insufficient capacity to serve the uses in the RPA; (ii) deteriorated, antiquated, obsolete or in disrepair; or (iii) lacking within the RPA.

I) Excessive Land Coverage and Overcrowding of Structures and Community Facilities: The over-intensive use of property and the crowding of buildings and accessory facilities onto a site. Examples of problem conditions warranting the designation of an area as exhibiting excessive land coverage are: (i) the presence of buildings either improperly situated on parcels or located on parcels of inadequate size and shape in relation to present-day standards of development for health and safety and (ii) the presence of multiple buildings on a single parcel. For there to be a finding of excessive land coverage, these parcels must exhibit one or more of the following conditions: insufficient provision for light and air within or around buildings, increased threat of spread of fire due to the close

proximity of buildings, lack of adequate or proper access to a public right-of-way, and lack of reasonably required off-street parking or inadequate provision for loading service.

J) Deleterious Land-Use or Layout: The existence of incompatible land-use relationships, buildings occupied by inappropriate mixed-uses or uses that are considered to be noxious, offensive or unsuitable for the surrounding area.

K) Environmental Clean-Up: The proposed RPA has incurred Illinois Environmental Protection Agency or United States Environmental Protection Agency remediation costs for (or a study conducted by an independent consultant recognized as having expertise in environmental remediation has determined a need for) the clean-up of hazardous waste, hazardous substances or underground storage tanks required by State or federal law. Any such remediation costs would constitute a material impediment to the development or redevelopment of the RPA.

L) Lack of Community Planning: The proposed RPA was developed prior to or without the benefit or guidance of a community plan. This means that the development occurred prior to the adoption by the municipality of a comprehensive or other community plan or that the plan was not followed at the time of the development of the area. This factor must be documented by evidence of adverse or incompatible land-use relationships, inadequate street layout, improper subdivision, parcels of inadequate shape and size to meet contemporary development standards or other evidence demonstrating an absence of effective community planning.

M) Lagging or Declining EAV: The total equalized assessed value (EAV) of the proposed RPA has declined for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years prior to the year in which the RPA is designated, or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the balance of the municipality for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years, for which information is available or increasing at an annual rate that is less than the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the United States Department of Labor or successor agency for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years prior to the year in which the RPA is designated.

III. METHODOLOGY OF EVALUATION

The RPA was examined to assess the applicability of the different factors required for qualification for TIF designation under the TIF Act. Data have been collected from the RPA, the Village and Cook County and used to determine relevance and severity of conditions compared against the statutory factors. Additionally, land and buildings within the RPA were examined to determine the applicability of the 13 different factors for qualification for TIF designation under the TIF Act as a conservation area. The following steps were undertaken in this process:

- 1) Site visits to the RPA were undertaken by representatives from KMA. These site visits required the area to be walked multiple times by the same team while taking notes, filling out site surveys and taking photographs. The purpose of these site visits included parcel counts, address matches, and the identification of current land uses, building conditions, lot conditions, and traffic flow. KMA documented the area's conditions through site surveys, notes and photography.
- 2) To determine if the RPA qualified as a conservation area, the age of the buildings were ascertained by matching site surveys to Cook County tax and building records.
- 3) KMA conducted evaluations of exterior structures and associated site improvements, noting the conditions which would be relevant to the qualifying factors on the site surveys.
- 4) KMA reviewed the 2013-2018 tax information from Cook County, parcel tax maps, site data, local history (discussions with Village staff) for an evaluation of area-wide factors that have affected the area's development to determine if any would be considered qualifying factors.
- 5) KMA performed EAV trend analysis to ascertain whether EAV growth in the RPA underperformed relative to EAV growth in the balance of the Village and the Consumer Price Index-All Urban Consumers.

IV. QUALIFICATION FINDINGS FOR RPA

Based upon KMA's evaluation and analysis of each of the eligibility factors summarized in Section II, the following factors are presented to support qualification of the RPA as a conservation area. The factors identified are summarized in Table 3 below. These factors were found to be clearly present and reasonably distributed throughout the RPA, as required under the Act.

Table 3. Summary of Conservation Area Findings

Maximum Factors to Qualify per Statute	13
Minimum Factors to Qualify per Statute	3
Qualifying Factors Present in RPA	7 <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Lagging/Declining EAV- Excessive Vacancies- Deterioration- Lack of Community Planning- Deleterious Land Use/Layout- Inadequate Utilities- Obsolescence

Findings as a conservation area - The RPA is found to qualify as a conservation area under the statutory criteria set forth in the TIF Act. As indicated in Section II, KMA performed a two-step assessment, first researching if 50% or more of the structures within the conservation area were over 35 years of age. Based upon Cook County Assessor and site survey data, at least forty-nine (49) of the fifty-six (56) structures in the RPA, or 88%, were 35 years in age or older (Please see Table 4 below).

Table 4. Conservation Area Findings - Structures

Total Number of Structures in RPA	56
Total Number of Structures 35 Years or Older	49
Percentage of Structures 35yrs Years or Older	88%

Conservation area factors- KMA reviewed the criteria needed to qualify an area as a conservation area, finding that seven (7) factors were present:

- 1) Lagging or Declining EAV: This factor is present if the total equalized assessed value (or "EAV") of the proposed RPA has declined for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years prior to the year in which the RPA is designated, or is increasing at an annual rate that is less than the balance of the municipality for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years, or increasing at an annual rate that is less than the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the United States Department of Labor or successor agency for three (3) of the last five (5) calendar years prior to the year in which the RPA is designated. The RPA qualifies under two (2) of these measurements. Please see Table 5 below for a breakout of the trends.

Table 5. EAV Trends for Proposed Study Area

	2018	2017	2016	2015	2014	2013
Total EAV for Proposed TIF District	6,448,831	6,126,269	5,275,003	5,260,787	5,350,776	5,819,624
EAV Change (%)	5.3%	16.1%	0.3%	-1.7%	-8.1%	-
Village EAV (Excluding TIF)	389,421,220	402,573,253	341,785,813	325,781,113	334,714,450	354,779,599
Village EAV Change (%)	-3.3%	17.8%	4.9%	-2.7%	-5.7%	-
CPI- All Urban Consumers	2.4%	2.1%	1.3%	0.1%	1.6%	-

Sources: Cook County Assessor & U.S. Census Bureau

Note: 2018 is the most recent year of which data from the Cook County Assessor is available

The RPA's EAV has lagged behind the balance of the municipality for three (3) of the last five (5) years. The RPA's EAV has also lagged behind the CPI-U (Consumer Price Index- All Urban Consumers) for three (3) of the last five (5) years. Just one of these quantifiable measures would qualify the RPA for this factor under the TIF Act, but the RPA's qualification under two (2) measures highlights the area's need for redevelopment and indicates the presence of additional factors that deter growth.

- 2) Excessive Vacancies: The Act identifies excessive vacancies as the presence of buildings that are unoccupied or under-utilized which exert an adverse influence on the area due to the frequency, extent, or duration of the vacancies.

Data obtained from site surveys indicate that at least approximately 16 of the 57 commercial units in the RPA, or 28% were vacant at the time of the survey. Interviews with Village staff indicates that the extent of this vacancy has persisted over several years. A lack of signage, deteriorated or obsolete signage, use of window coverings, number of "for lease" signs and the presence of deteriorating surface improvements and secondary building components exacerbate the adverse impacts of these vacancies. This persisting visibility of vacancy impacts the RPA's desirability and contributes to an environment that signals declining economic viability.

- 3) Deterioration: The Act defines deterioration as the physical decline of surface improvements, primary building components, and secondary buildings components such as doors, windows, porches or gutters. With respect to surface improvements, deterioration is determined by the condition of roadways, alleys, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, off-street parking and surface storage areas (including but not limited to surface cracking, crumbling,

potholes, depressions, loose paving material and weeds protruding through paved surfaces).

In the RPA, deterioration was found to be present throughout the area. Deterioration in surface improvements, particularly within alleys and parking lots, was pervasive. Such deterioration included cracking and crumbling surfaces and potholes and depressions causing water retention. Deterioration of surface improvements was pronounced in alleys that serve as loading/unloading zones for local businesses and in areas that once served now vacant commercial units.

Deterioration was also found to be present in secondary building components. This included doorways, windows, gutters, building eaves and building surfaces that were in a state of disrepair and in need of maintenance. The presence of deterioration was found in both vacant and non-vacant sites, but the severity of deterioration was pronounced in vacant commercial units. Additionally, The Village has determined that several storefronts have deteriorated signs as defined by the Village's code enforcement requirements. This high degree of deterioration contributes to an adverse aesthetic impact on the area.

- 4) Lack of Community Planning: The Act states that if the proposed RPA was developed prior to or without the benefit or guidance of a community plan, this factor is present. This factor must be documented by evidence of adverse or incompatible land-use relationships, inadequate street layout, improper subdivision, parcels of inadequate shape and size to meet contemporary development standards or other evidence demonstrating an absence of effective community planning.

Much of the development within the RPA occurred under a lack of comprehensive and coordinated planning. The Village's zoning ordinance, the first municipal plan governing land use, was adopted in 1964. The 2020 Master Plan, the Village's first formal land use plan, was adopted in 2004. Based upon the Cook County Assessor's valuation data, plus site survey data, at least forty-six (46) of the fifty-six (56) structures in the RPA, or 82%, were built prior to the adoption of the Village's zoning ordinance. At least forty-nine (49) of the fifty-six (56) structures in the RPA, or 88%, were built prior to the adoption of the Village's 2020 Master Plan.

Lack of community planning in the RPA is evidenced by incompatible land-use relationships, inadequate street layout and the presence of parcels of inadequate shape and size to meet contemporary development standards.

Incompatible land use relationships are present within the RPA. Low-density single-family residences abut alleys that act as loading/unloading zones for local businesses. Little to no screening/buffering is present to separate these uses, regularly exposing local residents to conditions associated with commercial uses (e.g. loading/unloading, parking, light pollution, etc.)

An inadequate street layout is present within the RPA and is evidenced by inadequate traffic circulation that challenges the coordination of redevelopment. The Brookfield

Active Transportation Plan (2017) identifies six “difficult” intersections within the RPA. These include areas around the six-way intersection of Grand Boulevard, Prairie Avenue, Brookfield Avenue and Fairview Avenue where motorists, bicyclists and pedestrians face dangerous conditions caused by inadequate traffic signalization and traffic-calming improvements. These conditions are exacerbated by the grade-level rail crossing at Prairie Avenue, between Brookfield Avenue and Burlington Avenue. Review and mitigation may be necessary to coordinate redevelopment activities.

Additional challenges are presented by a lack of adequate parking to serve businesses along Grand Boulevard. The parking that is present is angled along Grand Boulevard, forcing motorists to back into traffic to exit parking stalls. These conditions contribute to the dangerous environment and inadequate traffic circulation. Review and mitigation of such conditions may be necessary to coordinate redevelopment activities.

Parcels throughout the RPA are inadequate in size and shape to meet contemporary development standards. These conditions are most prominent along Grand Boulevard where many structures overlay several small parcels and the roadway orientation results in irregular parcel shapes that challenge redevelopment activities. Additionally, certain parcels along Fairview Avenue are shallow in depth and may benefit from consolidation.

This is not to say that improvements did not take place over the years, but that they were implemented without the guidance of an updated and modern master plan and zoning ordinance implemented for the long-term benefit for the RPA. A lack of such efforts has contributed to the evolution of factors herein presented.

5) Deleterious Land Use or Layout: The act states that deleterious land use and layout occurs with the existence of incompatible land use relationships, buildings occupied by inappropriate mixed-uses or uses considered to be noxious, offensive or unsuitable for the surrounding area.

As described above, incompatible land use relationships are present in the RPA. Residential uses abut commercial uses with little to no screening/buffering. Many residential uses are directly exposed to alleys used by local businesses as loading/unloading zones, regularly exposing residents to conditions associated with commercial uses. Additionally, the presence of an inadequate street layout caused by several hazardous intersections and problematic parking coordination impairs traffic circulation and creates a dangerous environment for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists.

6) Inadequate Utilities: This factor is present if underground and overhead utilities such as storm sewers and storm drainage, sanitary sewers, water lines and gas, telephone and electric services that are shown to be inadequate. Inadequate utilities are those that are: (i) of insufficient capacity for the Village to serve the uses in the RPA; (ii) deteriorated, antiquated, obsolete or in disrepair; or (iii) lacking within the RPA.

Hancock Engineering, the Village’s civil engineering consultant, has identified several conditions which evidence the presence of inadequate public utilities within the RPA.

Combined sewers within the RPA are inadequate in capacity to convey stormwater runoff and handle sanitary sewage flows. These sewers are typically over 80 years in age, have inadequate service connections and have reached the end of service life. Coordinated redevelopment may require the replacement of all combined sewers within the RPA.

Similarly, all water mains within the RPA, many being over 100 years in age, have reached the end of service life. Coordinated redevelopment may require the replacement of all 6" water mains and service lines to individual properties within the RPA.

- 7) Obsolescence: The Act states that obsolescence is the condition or process of falling into disuse or structures that have become ill-suited for their original use. The onset of obsolescence can be measured through qualitative and quantitative means and can be described as economic obsolescence and functional obsolescence.

Both economic and functional obsolescence are evidenced by the presence of factors previously identified in this report. For example, building age, EAV declines, deterioration in buildings and surface improvements, inadequate traffic circulation, inadequate infrastructure and high vacancy rates reflect obsolescence. By these measures, the RPA exhibits obsolescence due to structures falling into disuse or being ill-suited for their original use.

From a qualitative perspective, obsolescence is evident throughout the RPA due to excessive vacancies, deterioration, a lack of community planning, deleterious land-use/layout and the presence of inadequate utilities.

V. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS / GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF QUALIFICATION

The following is a summary of relevant qualification findings as it relates to the Village's potential designation of the RPA.

1. The area is contiguous and is greater than 1½ acres in size;
2. The proposed RPA qualifies as a conservation area. Further, the conservation area factors found in the RPA are present to a meaningful extent and are distributed throughout the area. A more detailed analysis of the qualification findings is outlined in Section V of this report;
3. All property in the area would substantially benefit by the proposed redevelopment project improvements;
4. The growth of EAV for all taxing districts underlying the area, including the Village, has been impaired by the factors found present in the area; and
5. The area would not be subject to redevelopment without the investment of public funds, including property tax increments.

In the judgment of KMA, these findings provide the Village with sufficient justification to consider designation of the RPA.

APPENDIX A
Tax Parcels for RPA

Individual Tax Parcels - Brookfield, IL Grand Boulevard TIF

15-34-420-001-0000	15-34-421-009-0000	15-34-422-003-0000
15-34-420-002-0000	15-34-421-010-0000	15-34-422-004-0000
15-34-420-003-0000	15-34-421-014-0000	15-34-422-005-0000
15-34-420-005-0000	15-34-421-018-0000	15-34-422-006-0000
15-34-420-006-0000	15-34-421-019-0000	15-34-422-012-0000
15-34-420-007-0000	15-34-421-020-0000	15-34-422-029-0000
15-34-420-011-0000	15-34-421-021-0000	15-34-422-030-0000
15-34-420-012-0000	15-34-421-022-0000	15-34-426-001-0000
15-34-420-013-0000	15-34-421-023-0000	15-34-426-002-0000
15-34-420-022-0000	15-34-421-024-0000	15-34-431-043-0000
15-34-420-023-0000	15-34-421-025-0000	15-34-431-045-0000
15-34-420-024-0000	15-34-421-026-0000	15-34-432-001-0000
15-34-420-025-0000	15-34-421-034-0000	15-34-432-002-0000
15-34-420-026-0000	15-34-421-035-0000	15-34-432-003-0000
15-34-420-027-0000	15-34-421-036-0000	15-34-432-004-0000
15-34-420-028-0000	15-34-421-037-0000	15-34-432-005-0000
15-34-420-029-0000	15-34-421-039-0000	15-34-432-006-0000
15-34-420-030-0000	15-34-421-040-0000	15-34-501-005-0000
15-34-420-031-0000	15-34-421-041-1001	
15-34-420-032-0000	15-34-421-041-1002	
15-34-420-033-0000	15-34-421-041-1003	
15-34-420-034-0000	15-34-421-041-1004	
15-34-420-035-0000	15-34-421-041-1005	
15-34-420-036-0000	15-34-421-041-1006	
15-34-420-037-0000	15-34-421-041-1007	
15-34-420-038-0000	15-34-421-041-1008	
15-34-420-039-0000	15-34-421-041-1009	
15-34-420-040-0000	15-34-421-041-1010	
15-34-420-041-0000	15-34-421-041-1011	
15-34-420-042-0000	15-34-421-041-1012	
15-34-420-043-0000	15-34-421-041-1013	
15-34-420-044-0000	15-34-421-041-1014	
15-34-420-045-0000	15-34-421-041-1015	
15-34-420-046-0000	15-34-421-041-1016	
15-34-420-047-0000	15-34-421-041-1017	
15-34-421-002-0000	15-34-421-042-0000	
15-34-421-003-0000	15-34-421-043-0000	
15-34-421-004-0000	15-34-421-044-0000	
15-34-421-007-0000	15-34-421-045-0000	
15-34-421-008-0000	15-34-422-001-0000	
15-34-421-009-0000	15-34-422-002-0000	
15-34-421-010-0000	15-34-422-003-0000	
15-34-421-014-0000	15-34-422-004-0000	

APPENDIX B
Boundary Map of RPA

